

SALT LAKE COUNTY GROUNDWATER MEETING
NOVEMBER 2, 1990
Minutes

This meeting was held to discuss proposals for the management of the Salt Lake County groundwater. For the benefit of those not present at previous meetings, Bob Morgan reiterated the facts and figures which have led up to this point. It is the State Engineer's responsibility to protect the aquifer, and withdrawals will need to be limited to the yield. If no agreement can be reached, he will have to do it by priority.

Bob solicited proposals and the following were offered:

Dallin Jensen, representing Salt Lake City, Sandy City, and the Metropolitan Water District of SLC. He realizes there is a serious problem and suggested the following:

1. Approved applications on which proof has been submitted would be treated as certificated rights.
2. When ruling on extensions--if the well is not drilled, application would be reduced by 50% of total acre-foot volume that the right could produce. Diversion or priority would not be reduced. If well is drilled, application would be reduced by 25%.
3. Proposed policy would be equal throughout the valley.
4. Small applications would be limited to 1.5 acre-feet annually, and would not be approved where a public supply is available or accessible within a reasonable distance. No applications would be approved for industrial use.
5. A task force should not be formed. Parties should submit their proposals to the State Engineer and he will formulate a policy.

On wells that fall into the 50% limitation category, all wells of one applicant could be averaged together.

The condition on drawdown probably needs to be more than 12 feet, with some latitude given. It is also conditioned on not interfering with others.

David Ovard, Salt Lake County Water Conservancy District. They have many filings in the 1950's, and have deferred developing many because of the CUP. They have also incurred substantial costs with the CUP and the Jacob/Welby exchange. Their Board passed a resolution to develop their groundwater as much as possible. He is sympathetic to Dallin's proposal and agreed they could probably cut back, but they do want to preserve their filings. He asked that we remember what they have done with their storage projects.

Ed Clyde. He expressed a negative response to Dallin's proposal. He doesn't think a uniform policy will work very well. He favors conjunctive use management by a few large entities. Other suggestions were:

Page Two

1. A statute change to approve municipal use out of priority. We need to protect municipal use.
2. Need to look at artificial recharge.
3. Need to look at groundwater compared with surface water.
4. Proof should be submitted on wells that are more than 75% completed, but less than 100%.

In a question and answer session, the following was stated:

The limitation would apply to agricultural filings as well as municipal, but there are not many pending agricultural filings.

A question was asked about artificial recharge. The Salt Lake County project was explained. The water would come from the Provo River during winter months. Treated water would be injected. We are drafting a general bill on recharge, and will then develop specific administrative rules.

It was stated that there are some errors or omissions in our database summary report. If anyone thinks there is an error, please bring the specifics to our attention.

There were no other comments made. Following is the schedule which will be followed in setting the new policy:

All written proposals have to be submitted to our office by November 20.

The proposals will be available for review by the public in our office between November 20 and December 10.

Comments may be made to the proposals before December 10.

We will send out a proposed policy about January 1. We will also put a notice in the newspaper under Public Notices.

We will have one last meeting the end of January; after that, the policy will become effective.